ZINAS

		NSMITTAL OF APPEA NTERFERENCES & I UNDER 37 C.F.F.F.	Docket No. IDS-13802/14							
In Re Application Of: Venegas, Ir. SEP 1 5 2005										
Ap	plication No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Customer No.	Group Art Unit	Confirmation No.				
	10/054,122	11/13/2001	Tan Le	25006	3632	6422				
Invention: MODULAR, COLLAPSIBLE BASE FOR FURNITURE, PARTICULARLY CONFERENCE TABLES, AND THE LIKE										
<b></b> _						,				
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:										
This is a combined Transmittal of Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences and petition under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing an Appeal Brief.										
App	• • •	` _ ` '	ion of time of (check desired t							
☐ One month ☐ Two months ☐ Three months ☐ Four months ☐ Five months										
	from:	July 13, 2005	until:	Sept.	13, 2005 Date					
The		Date		Sept.	13, 2005 Date					
The		Date	until:  on of Time has been calculate  Fee for Appeal Brief:	Sept.	13, 2005 Date					
The		Date	on of Time has been calculate	Sept.  I ed as shown be	13, 2005 Date					
	e fee for the App	Date	on of Time has been calculate Fee for Appeal Brief:	Sept.  I ed as shown be	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00					
тот	FAL FEE FOR	Date peal Brief and Extension  APPEAL BRIEF AND	on of Time has been calculate Fee for Appeal Brief: Fee for Extension of Time	Sept.  1 ed as shown be \$250 2: \$225	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00					
тот	FAL FEE FOR	Date peal Brief and Extension  APPEAL BRIEF AND peal Brief and extension	on of Time has been calculate Fee for Appeal Brief: Fee for Extension of Time:  EXTENSION OF TIME:	Sept.  250 250 251 2525 2525 2525 2525 2525 2	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00	<b>d</b> .				
TO1	FAL FEE FOR A fee for the App A check in the	Date peal Brief and Extension  APPEAL BRIEF AND peal Brief and extension	on of Time has been calculate Fee for Appeal Brief: Fee for Extension of Time:  EXTENSION OF TIME: on of time is to be paid as follo for the Appeal Brief a	Sept.  250 250 251 2525 2525 2525 2525 2525 2	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00 f time is enclosed	d.				
TOT	FAL FEE FOR A fee for the App A check in the Please charge The Director is	Date Deal Brief and Extension Deal Brief and extension Deal Brief and extension Deal Brief and extension Deposit Account No. Shereby authorized to	on of Time has been calculate Fee for Appeal Brief: Fee for Extension of Time:  EXTENSION OF TIME: on of time is to be paid as follo for the Appeal Brief a	sept.  If the description of the sept.  Sept.  1. If the sept.  \$250 \$225 \$475  Sept.  \$475  Sep	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00 f time is enclosed	d.				
TOT The	fee for the App  fee for the App  A check in the  Please charge  The Director is  communication	Date peal Brief and Extension  APPEAL BRIEF AND peal Brief and extension amount of pe Deposit Account No. s hereby authorized to an or credit any overpa	on of Time has been calculate Fee for Appeal Brief: Fee for Extension of Time:  EXTENSION OF TIME: on of time is to be paid as follo for the Appeal Brief a  07-1180 in the amo	sept.  If the description of the sept.  Sept.  1. If the sept.  \$250 \$225 \$475  Sept.  \$475  Sep	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00 f time is enclosed	d.				
TOT The	fee for the App  FAL FEE FOR A  fee for the App  A check in the  Please charge  The Director is  communicatio  Any addit  Any pate	Date peal Brief and Extension  APPEAL BRIEF AND peal Brief and extension amount of the Deposit Account No. Is hereby authorized to an or credit any overpational filing fees require to not application procession	on of Time has been calculated. Fee for Appeal Brief: Fee for Extension of Time:  EXTENSION OF TIME:  on of time is to be paid as follow for the Appeal Brief at the amount of the follow ayment to Deposit Account Noted under 37 C.F.R. 1.16. ing fees under 37 CFR 1.17. equired, please consider this attention of the follows are the follows and the follows are the fol	Sept.  250 250 250 250 250 250 250 250 250 25	13, 2005 Date low: 0.00 5.00 f time is enclosed iated with this					

COMBINED TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF TO THE BOARD OF PATENT .APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES & PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. (36fa) (Sepall Entity)											
In Re Application Of: Posa et al SEP 1 5 2005											
Application No. 10/054,122	Filing Date 11/13/2001	Tan Le		Customer No. 25006	Group Art Unit 3632	Confirmation No. 6422					
Invention: MODULAR, COLLAPSIBLE BASE FOR FURNITURE, PARTICULARLY CONFERENCE TABLES, AND THE LIKE											
This combined Transmittal of Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences and petition for extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) is respectfully submitted by the undersigned:  Dated: Sept. 13, 2005  John G. Posa Reg. No. 37,424 Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle et al PO Box 7021 Troy, MI 48007-7021											
I certify that deposit account States Patent ar (Fax no.	this document and auth is being facsimile transmod Trademark Office ) on  Signature  Printed Name of Person Signature  te may only be used if int.	norization to charge nitted to the United	deposite sufficient addresse Alexandr	y certify that d with the Unite t postage as fire ed to "Commission ria, VA 22313-145 9/1305 (Date)  Signature of Person Sheryl	this correspondenced States Postal States Patents, P.C. O" [37 CFR 1.8(a) or Mailing Correspondent L. Hammer  Person Mailing Correspondent Person Mailing Correspondent Postal Po	Service with an envelope D. Box 1450, In envelope D. Box 1450, In ence					

•



### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE **BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of: Venegas, Jr.

Serial No.: 10/054,122 Group No.: 3632

Filed: Nov. 13, 2001 Examiner: Tan Le

For: MODULAR, COLLAPSIBLE BASE FOR FURNITURE, PARTICULARLY

CONFERENCE TABLES, AND THE LIKE

### **APPELLANTS' BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §1.192**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief S Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

BOX 7021

S.

### **Real Party in Interest**

The real party and interest in this case is Frank Venegas, Jr., Applicant and Appellant.

### ₹II. **Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a be a be III. a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

### **Status of Claims**

The present application was filed with 17 claims. Claim 18 was added in January 2003. Claims 15-16 have been allowed. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 9, 10 and 17 have been withdrawn. <sup>©</sup>Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-16 and 18 remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-14 and 18 are gending, rejected and under appeal. Claims 1 and 11 are the independent claims.

> 10054122 09/16/2005 SDENBOB1 00000003 071180

GIFFORD. Status of Amendments Filed Subsequent to FC: 2402 02 FC: 2252 250.00 DA 225.00 DA **Final Rejection** 

No after-final amendments have been filed.

### (248) 647-6000 SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C GROH,

### V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Independent claim 1 resides in a collapsible table, comprising a table base top portion disposed in a generally horizontal plane, the top portion comprising a plurality of releasably interconnected horizontal members for supporting the table top thereon; a support portion for supporting the table base top portion in the generally horizontal plane, the support portion comprising a plurality of elongated members releasably interconnected to one another, the elongated members including leg members having lower ends for engaging the floor; removable structural fittings releasably interconnecting the table base top portion and the support portion so as to form a generally rigid base; and replaceable polymerized sheathing surrounding each of the horizontal members and each of the elongated members, the sheathing having an inner diameter equal to or greater than the outer diameter of the members.

Independent claim 11 resides in a collapsible table, comprising a glass table top; four spaced apart generally vertical legs each having a lower end configured to contact the support surface and an upper end, each of the legs having a height and an outer diameter; replaceable polymerized sheathing surrounding each of the legs, the sheathing having an inner diameter equal to or greater than the outer diameter of the legs; a plurality of spaced apart horizontal rails for supporting the table top thereon, said horizontal rails interconnected with the upper ends of the legs, each of the horizontal rails having an outer diameter and a length; and replaceable polymerized sheathing surrounding each of the horizontal rails, the sheathing having an inner diameter equal to or greater than the outer diameter of the horizontal rails. (Specification, page 2, lines 2-10).

### VI. Grounds of Objection/Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal

- 1. The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 11-12, 14 and 18 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,883,257 to Delafield in view of Patent No. 4,662,591 to Encontre.
- 2. The rejection of claim 6 as being unpatentable under U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,883,257 to Delafield in view of Patent No. 4,662,591 to Encontre, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,462,021 to Hawke et al.

## (248) 647-6000

### VII. Argument

### A. Claims 1 and 11

The independent claims of this application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,883,257 to Delafield in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,662,591 to Encontre (as well as additional references for a few of the dependent claims).

Applicant submits that there is no support for the Delafield/Encontre combination, largely because there is absolutely no motivation to combine these references. Delafield teaches a molded joint component for tubular frame furniture, such as "occasional tables, bookcases and the like" (column 1, line 6). The Examiner certainly concedes that the construction of Delafield is silent as to any sort of plastic sheathing, but argues that since Encontre discloses "a replaceable sheathing or decorative cover (92)", that it would have been obvious to combine these references "for the desirable purpose of simply catching more area of the table including the table legs and the horizontal members to create a more appearance [sic] and more desired decorative effect."

This reasoning is flawed on several grounds. First, claim 1 includes the limitation of replaceable polymerized sheathing, whereas the cover 92 of Encontre is wooden (column 4, lines 44-48). Thus, even if this combination of references were legitimate, Applicant's claims would not result. Secondly, to the extent that Applicant understands the Examiner's argument, the way in which the table is "caught" by the table legs, is with a small horizontal flange 34, such that putting polymeric sheathing on the tubes of Delafield would defeat the use of that tab in that less of it would be used. It is never obvious to destroy an intended goal or function of a prior-art reference.

Third, the argument that the references should be combined "to create a more appearance [sic] and more desired decorative effect," makes no sense, since the desired decorative effect of Delafield is the use of bright metal plating on all members, including the corner joints. Thus, to add any kind of sheathing would defeat that purpose. Moreover, if the teachings of Encontre were combined with Delafield, the bright metal plating would be covered up with wood. Finally, to reject claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must provide a reason why one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have been led to combine references to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Moreover, there must be something in the prior art that suggests the proposed modification, other than the hindsight gained from knowledge that the inventor choose to combine these particular things in this particular

TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 2701 TROY CENTER DR. Date: Sept. 13, 2005 GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

way. Uniroyal Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner is further required to make specific findings on a suggestion to combine prior art references. In Re Dembeczak, 175 F.3d 994, 1000-01, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617-19 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

### Conclusion

In conclusion, for the arguments of record and the reasons set forth above, all pending claims of the subject application continue to be in condition for allowance and Appellant seeks the Board's concurrence at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

John G. Posa Reg. No. 34,424

Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle, Anderson & Citkowski, P.C.

PO Box 7021

Troy, MI 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300

### **APPENDIX A**

### **CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

1. A collapsible table, comprising:

TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000

SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021

2701 TROY CENTER DR.,

SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

a table base top portion disposed in a generally horizontal plane, the top portion comprising a plurality of releasably interconnected horizontal members for supporting the table top thereon;

a support portion for supporting the table base top portion in the generally horizontal plane, the support portion comprising a plurality of elongated members releasably interconnected to one another, the elongated members including leg members having lower ends for engaging the floor;

removable structural fittings releasably interconnecting the table base top portion and the support portion so as to form a generally rigid base; and

replaceable polymerized sheathing surrounding each of the horizontal members and each of the elongated members, the sheathing having an inner diameter equal to or greater than the outer diameter of the members.

- 2. The table base according to claim 1, wherein all of the horizontal and the elongated members are straight.
- 4. The table base according to claim 1, wherein each of the horizontal and elongated members are hollow metal tubes.
- 5. The table base according to claim 4, wherein at least one of the structural fittings comprises a slip-in fitting having a base with a radiused end surface matching the outer diameter of one of the tubes, the fitting further having an engagement member extending from the base, the engagement member configured to engage the inner diameter of one of the tubes.
  - 6. The table base according to claim 5, wherein the slip-in structural fitting further comprises a connector operable to connect the fitting to one of the tubes such that the end surface mates with the outer diameter of the tube.

(248) 647-6000 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

- 7. The table base according to claim 5, wherein the base of the slip-in structural fitting has an outer diameter substantially the same as the outer diameter of the tube engaged by the engagement member.
  - 11. A collapsible table, comprising:

a glass table top;

four spaced apart generally vertical legs each having a lower end configured to contact the support surface and an upper end, each of the legs having a height and an outer diameter;

replaceable polymerized sheathing surrounding each of the legs, the sheathing having an inner diameter equal to or greater than the outer diameter of the legs;

a plurality of spaced apart horizontal rails for supporting the table top thereon, said horizontal rails interconnected with the upper ends of the legs, each of the horizontal rails having an outer diameter and a length; and

replaceable polymerized sheathing surrounding each of the horizontal rails, the sheathing having an inner diameter equal to or greater than the outer diameter of the horizontal rails.

12. The table base according to claim 11, wherein said plurality of horizontal rails comprises:

a first pair of parallel spaced apart horizontal rails, each rail extending between the upper end of two of the vertical legs and having a first end and a second end; and

a second pair of parallel spaced apart horizontal rails, one rail extending between the first ends of the first pair of horizontal rails and the other rail extending between the second ends of the first pair of horizontal rails.

- 13. The table base according to claim 11, further comprising a first leg brace extending between two of said legs between the lower and upper ends thereof, the leg brace having a first end interconnected with one leg and a second end interconnected with the other leg.
  - 14. The table base according to claim 11, wherein the sheathing extends substantially the

entire height of the legs and the entire length of the horizontal rails.

18. The collapsible table of claim 1, where the table top is glass.

### APPENDIX B

### **EVIDENCE**

None.

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000 ==

# GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000 ==

### APPENDIX C

### RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None.

(